



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/846,121	04/30/2001	Joseph B. Elad	QUANTUM-1	5233
54884 7590 05/01/2007 GOMEZ INTERNATIONAL PATENT OFFICE, LLC 1501 N. RODNEY STREET SUITE 101 WILMINGTON, DE 19806			EXAMINER DASS, HARISH T	
			ART UNIT 3693	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 05/01/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/846,121	ELAD ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Harish T. Dass	3693	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 February 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-60 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-56 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) 57-60 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                        | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

### DETAILED ACTION

The following communication is in response to Applicant's amendment filed on 02/22/2007.

#### ***Status of Claims***

Claims 1-56 are pending.

Claims 57-60 are restricted.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed 02/22/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive, as discussed below.

- a. Response to Arguments previously presented are maintained (see paper number 20060912).
- b. The following are response to argument filed on 02/22/2007.

In response to Applicant's argument (recited page 19) Election/Restriction, Examiner does not agree with Applicant's that claims 57-60 are not restrictive, because.

1). claim 1 is directed to a computer system and computer implemented method for finding best matches between buyers' request and sellers' offerings in a market (see preamble of claim 1) and claim 57 is directed to a method for providing a market that constructs matches between buyers' request and sellers' offerings (see preamble of claim 57). The scopes of these claims are different.

2). The limitations of claim 1 and claim 57 are different.

In response to Applicant's argument (recited page 19) Rejection under 35 U.S.C.

Art Unit: 3693

§112, considering the explanation and **provided reference**, this rejection is removed.

In response to Applicant's argument (recited on page ) "On Page 16 of the Office Action, the examiner states that Shoham does not **describe a system for representing arbitrary** attributes of an offer, or for relating the price of the offer to such attributes, are not recited in the presently rejected claims. Applicants respectfully disagree." Applicant is requested to stick to the language of the claim limitations. The language of claim 1 does not include the language previously presented and argued. Examiner in the interest of prosecution time will respond to those arguments that related to written language of the limitations not to the arguments that do relate to unclaimed limitation(s). The word/phrase "schedule"/"a schedule could depend on ..." does not appear in claim 1.

Claim 1 limitations are:

(a) creating a buyers abstract representation of at least one attribute of a request, and the relationship between at least one utility of the request and at least one state of the at least one attribute;

(b) creating a sellers abstract representation of at least one attribute of an offer, and the relationship between the total price of the offering and at least one state of the at least one attribute;

(c) computing a rating for overall satisfaction of the at least one attribute of a request with respect to a given offer;

(d) determining the quantity and identity of assignments of *sellers'* offerings to *buyers'* requests that produces the best set of matches for a given market; and

(e) signaling that the quantities and identities of assignments are accepted and that the transaction is committed by *buyers* and *sellers*.

In response to Applicant's argument (recited page 23) "...The present invention automates more than the enumeration of attributes. It automates the consideration of the buyer's degree of satisfaction with states of those attributes" Applicant argues about limitation that is not claimed. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims, See *supra*.

In response to Applicant's argument (recited page 24) "The examiner states on Page 16 of the Office Action that the present claims do not include the features that applicants argue that Shoham lacks, such as a "committed protocol." Applicants respectfully disagree. ..." Applicant argues about limitation which is not claimed. See *supra*.

In response to Applicant's argument (recited page 23) "Applicant's argument made in the previous response (page 20) is that Lupien (FIG 8, 110, 112, Column 11, lines 1-16) uses rank ordering to order the satisfaction of buyer-seller pairs. The significance of this limitation of Lupien's invention is that it is not appropriate for

Art Unit: 3693

use with any number of arbitrary attributes". See supra. Examiner maintains the response previously provided (page 17 paper number 20060912).

In response to applicant's argument that "Applicants respectfully disagree and assert that the combination of the Primary references (Shoham and Conklin) do not disclose teachings, that when combined with Lupien, render the present invention obvious. As has been demonstrated previously ...", the fact that applicant has recognized another advantage which would flow naturally from following the suggestion of the prior art cannot be the basis for patentability when the differences would otherwise be obvious. See *Ex parte Obiaya*, 227 USPQ 58, 60 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985). see supra.

In response to Applicant's argument (recited page 30) that "Though the term ontology is used without explicit definition in the application, the term is well known in the art of Artificial Intelligence ... provides a special kind of meta-data, the relations ... For instance, a buyer may request a part with a torque capacity expressed in foot-lbs, while a seller describes such a capacity in Newton-meters. As long as both buyer's dimensions and sellers dimensions make reference to a common ontology, the relations given in the ontology can be used to construct an equivalence (1.0 Foot — Pound = 1.3558179 Newton-meters)." With broadest reasonable interpretation of the limitation, claim 18 remains rejected. However, in response to applicant's argument "relevant aspect of ontologies is that they provide descriptions that support

Art Unit: 3693

interoperability based on conceptual equivalence, rather than field identity" it should be pointed out the object oriented design, abstract, creating object, encapsulation and overloading functions are known.

### ***Election/Restrictions***

2. Newly submitted claims 57-60 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: independent claim adds a limitation "creating a buyer's specification of at least one market protocol", and protocol related limitations, which was not presented in original set of claims, which requires separate search in separate class. Original presentation was for computer system.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 57-60 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been

Art Unit: 3693

obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-6 and 28-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shoham et al (hereinafter Shoham - US 6,584,451) in view of Lupien et al (6,012,046).

Re. Claim 1, Shoham discloses (a) creating a *buyers* abstract representation of at least one attribute of a request, and the relationship between at least one utility of the request and at least one state of the at least one attribute [*see entire document particularly - Abstract; Figure 2; C2 L1-L32; C3 L40-L59; C4 L41-L47; C12 L25-L30*]; (b) creating a *sellers* abstract representation of at least one attribute of an offer, and the relationship between the total price of the offering and at least one state of the at least one attribute [*Figures 6A-6B; C2 L47-L56*]; (e) signaling that the quantities and identities of assignments are accepted and that the transaction is committed by *buyers* and *sellers* [*figures 6B, 12#1232; C2 L25-L27; C6 L9-L16*]. *Shoham does not explicitly disclose* (c) computing a rating for overall satisfaction of the at least one attribute of a request with respect to a given offer, and (d) determining the quantity and identity of assignments of *sellers'* offerings to *buyers'* requests that produces the best set of matches for a given market. However, *Lupien* discloses (c) computing a rating for overall satisfaction of the at least one attribute of a request with respect to a given offer, and (d) determining the quantity and identity of assignments of *sellers'* offerings to *buyers'* requests that produces the best set of matches for a given market [*Lupien – abstract; C1 L50-L52; C2 L65 to C3 L5; C11 L21-L46*] to provides a substantially greater price discovery across



Art Unit: 3693

*the full range of trade sizes.* It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the disclosure of Shoham and include computing a rating for overall satisfaction of the at least one attribute of a request with respect to a given offer, and (d) determining the quantity and identity of assignments of *sellers'* offerings to *buyers'* requests that produces the best set of matches for a given market, as disclosed by Lupien, to provide a crossing network that matches buy and sell orders (items, goods, etc.) based on satisfaction and quantity profile.

Re. Claim 2, *Lupien further* discloses (a) recording the request and offer data, along with the transaction price and quantity, for the committed transactions, and for other transactions that scored sufficiently well, and for requests and offers that were not matched in the market [*Lupien –C6 L14-L29*] *to store the buyers/sellers profiles in database which can be used later.* (b) inferring (COLLECTING) market value relationships from other data sources, such as *sellers'* advertisements, and or *buyers'* requests for proposals (market prices ) [*C1 L50-52*] *to set a market price.* And (c) using of mathematical function approximation techniques for constructing market value functions that describe the relationship between price and the states of various attributes in a hypothetical market [*C5 L1-L7; C14 L25-L40*] to compute a single size and price for transition. "It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to combine the disclosures of Shoham and Lupien to provide a system which can

Art Unit: 3693

store market data and utilize the data to calculate price based on the stored and accumulated values for better approximate market value or average value.

Re. Claims 3-4, Shoham discloses (a) forming the best partition of the *buyers'* requests into groups or singletons of requests whose representation of attributes can be satisfied by the same *seller* offering [ C4 L56 to C5 L15];(b) forming the combined abstract representation of the requests for the consortium, said representation which will satisfy each *buyer* in the consortium[C1 L50-L60]. *Shoham does not explicitly disclose* (c) constructing an artificial negotiating entity that will represent at least one consortium, and can conceal the identities of the *buyers* in the consortium. However, Lupien further discloses this step [C1 L40-L67] to preserve the anonymity of the traders. "It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to combine the disclosures of Shoham and Lupien to not disclose the identity of the trader as a business practice and better competition.

Re. Claim 5, Lupien further discloses wherein the at least one attribute includes both intrinsic qualities of the object of the request or offer, and extrinsic qualities of the transaction or market protocols, wherein the extrinsic attributes comprise commitment protocols and time qualifications [C5 L1-L7] to allow traders to input variables (attributes) other than price and quantity as a profile to provide specifics what they are looking for. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the disclosure of Shoham and include intrinsic

Art Unit: 3693

qualities and extrinsic qualities of trading object to better describe the nature of the object of trade.

Re. Claim 6, Shoham discloses (a) combining abstract representations from at least two market participants, to combine maximize the satisfaction for the consortium of those participants, and

(b) using *buyers'* consortiums rather than individual *buyers* and *sellers'* consortiums, or individual *sellers*, in determining the best set of matches, and whereby a transaction can be accomplished between consortia, rather than individual *buyers* and *sellers* (OBCS and SellCo which can be a company made of sellers e.g., agricultural cooperative club) [C2 L33-65].

Claims 28-33 have same limitations as claims 1-6 above, respectively. Therefore these claims are rejected with same rational as claims 1-6.

Claims 7-13, 16, 18, 22-27 and 34-40, 43, 45, 49-56, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shoham and Lupien, as applied to claims 1-6 and 28-33 above, further in view of Conklin et al (hereinafter Conklin – US 6,141,653).

Re. Claim 7, Shoham discloses (a) forming the best partition of the *buyers'* requests into groups or singletons of requests whose representation of attributes can be satisfied by the same *seller* offering *and* (b) forming the combined abstract representation of the

Art Unit: 3693

requests for the consortium, said representation which will satisfy each *buyer* in the consortium [C2 L57 to C3 L7; C4 L47 to C5 L14 ]. *Shoham does not explicitly disclose*

(c) constructing an artificial negotiating entity that will represent at least one consortium, and can conceal the identities of the buyers in the consortium; and automatically joining sellers' offerings in a consortium by: (d) forming the best partition of the sellers' offerings into groups or singletons of offerings which considered together achieve the highest values on hypothetical market transactions, with regard to the value functions constructed in claim 2; (e) forming the abstract representation of the offerings for the consortium, said representation which will represent each offer in the consortium; and (f) constructing an artificial negotiating entity that will represent at least one consortium, and can conceal the identities of the sellers in the consortium, and using the market value data from transactions to construct mathematical function approximations predicting the value of states of attributes for hypothetical transactions to construct a stream or compendium of market information. However, Conklin discloses (c) constructing an artificial negotiating entity that will represent at least one consortium, and can conceal the identities of the *buyers* in the consortium; and automatically joining *sellers'* offerings in a consortium by: (d) forming the best partition of the *sellers'* offerings into groups or singletons of offerings which considered together achieve the highest values on hypothetical market transactions (e) forming the abstract representation of the offerings for the consortium, said representation which will represent each offer in the consortium; and (f) a means of constructing an artificial negotiating entity that will represent at least one consortium, and can conceal the identities of the *sellers* in the

Art Unit: 3693

consortium, and using the market value data from transactions to construct mathematical function approximations predicting the value of states of attributes for hypothetical transactions to construct a stream or compendium of market information [Abstract; Figures 1c, -1g, 1j-1n, 3; C8 L49-L52; C18 L37-L65; C25 L21-L34] to provide comprehensive iterative bargaining abilities for both buyers and sellers that enable them to negotiate all the terms and conditions of a transaction not just the price. Lupien discloses and using the market value data from transactions to construct mathematical function approximations predicting the value of states of attributes for transactions to construct a stream or compendium of market information [C7 30-L53C20 L54 to C22 L45] to achieve highest value of mutual satisfaction. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the disclosures of Shoham and Lupien and add artificial negotiating entity and hypothetical market transactions, as disclosed by Conklin to provide comprehensive negotiating abilities for both buyers and sellers that enable them to negotiate all the terms and conditions of a transaction not just the price.

Re. Claims 8-13, Lupien further discloses further comprising numerically representing the determination of best assignments and quantities as an optimization problem and optimizing the assignments and quantities by finding the total of each *buyer's* and each *seller's* satisfaction with the transactions to be committed, comprises matching the at least one attribute of a request and the at least one attribute of an offer by inferring the match of the attribute qualities of a request which are logically implied by attribute

Art Unit: 3693

qualities of an offer, and further comprising determining the quantity and identity of assignments of *sellers'* offerings to *buyers'* requests which produce the best set of feasible matches for a given market, linear regression, numeric optimization, comprising using a total market excess value as the measure of highest total market value (satisfaction density) [C12 L33 to C14 L55; C12 L33-L36 (linear regression); C13 L48 to C14 L8 (numeric optimization)] to provide optimization approach which maximizes sequentially the mutual satisfaction at each stage of the allocation process, by assigning allocations based upon the highest remaining mutual satisfaction value and where the approach has the virtue of being computationally tractable and generally yielding allocations with tight spreads in price. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the disclosure of Shoham and Conklin and add optimization, as disclosed by Lupien, to best attributes which satisfies the transactions between the sellers and buyer.

Re. Claim 16 Shoham wherein the request and offer data, the transaction price and quantity, the committed transactions, other transactions that scored sufficiently well, and the requests and offers that were not matched in the market are made available to market participants [C7 L5-L45].

Re. Claim 18, Shoham or Lupien does not explicitly disclose wherein an ontology is used for inferring the match of the at least one attribute state of a request which is logically implied by the at least one attribute state of an offer. However, ontology or

Art Unit: 3693

meta-data (as defined by the applicant in remarks) is known in object oriented software to capsule the attributes, properties and functions associated with the property of a instance of an object (class) and store the object as a tool which can be modified without changing the software as whole and make use of the defined object as an entity. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the disclosure of Shoham and Lupien and include meta-data to make use of object oriented software for ease of use and maintenance of the software.

Re. Claims 22- 24, Shoham does not explicitly disclose invoking auction protocols when there is at least two requests per one offer or at least two offers per one request, wherein the abstract representation of the relationship of the utility of an attribute of the request, is created using at least one technique selected from the group consisting of (a) linear functions, (b) piece-wise linear functions, (c) logistic functions, (d) cubic splines, (e) look-up tables, and (f) other numeric functions that compute utility with respect to a given attribute's states, and wherein the abstract representation of the relationship between price of the offer and at least two states of an attribute of the offer, is created using at least one technique selected from the group consisting of (a) linear functions, (b) piece-wise linear functions, (c) logistic functions, (d) cubic splines, (e) look-up tables, and (f) other numeric functions that compute price with respect to a given attribute's states. However, these are will known for example, generally auction has more than one offer only the highest wins and statistical

Art Unit: 3693

calculations are commonly done to calculate and predict the probability of success and efficiency of a process or an outcome with costly experiment. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the disclosures of Shoham, Lupien and Conklin to add statistical analysis to predict the success of auction prior to auctioning the goods or service.

Re. Claim 25, Shoham discloses further comprising communicating the abstract representations of requests and offerings by termsheets and offersheets, respectively (allow buyers to quote prices and invite sellers to accept the quote and purchase terms) [C1 L24-L28; C10 L38-L50].

Re. Claim 26, Shoham does not explicitly further comprising describing the requests as employment positions and describing the offerings as employee attributes and compensation requirements. However, this is well known that an agent can request for employment.

Re. Claim 27. Shoham discloses further comprising describing the requests as tasks to be accomplished, and describing the offers as agents, people and or software, willing to accomplish those tasks [C1 L2 L17-L31].



Art Unit: 3693

Claims 34-40, 43, 45, 49-54 have same limitations as claims 7-13, 16, 18, and 22-27 above, respectively. Therefore these claims are rejected with same rational as claims 7-13, 16, 18, and 22-27.

Re. Claim 55, Shoham discloses wherein the information is communicated through the internet by internet protocol messages[C1 L15-L20].

Re. Claim 56. Shoham does not explicitly disclose wherein buyers and sellers access the system via web pages, Java clients, or other executable client programs. However, this is well known to which allows the user (buyer/seller) to place order using commonly distributed web browsers.

Claims 14-15, 17, 41-42 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shoham, Lupien and Conklin as applied to claims 10 and 37 above, and further in view of Verba et al (hereinafter Verba – US 6236977).

Re. Claims 14-15 and 17, Neither Shoham nor Lupien or Conklin discloses comprising using a multiagent system to distribute the processing across many processors and memory devices to achieve timely calculations of best assignments and quantities, wherein a measure of the utility at the least one state of the at least one attribute is used to compute a rating for the overall satisfaction of a request with respect to a given

Art Unit: 3693

offering by using at least one technique selected from the group consisting of: (a) weighted fuzzy-logic conjunction operators, (b) weighted geometric means, (c) a weighted version of Yager's T-NORM, (d) weighted arithmetic means, and (e) a weighted combination, with the weights derived via analytic hierarchy analysis, and wherein different instances of at least one module of the entire system is specialized for each different market. However, Verba discloses these steps [Abstract; Figures 1-4, 9; C2 L13-L36; C3 L26-L37; C4 L38-L60; C6 L24-L53; C22 L66 to C23 L56] to creating a uniform measure of value and a sophisticated computer-implemented business management system, which describes both in general terms, and with respect to specifics useful in real estate marketing where the buyer has its own requirements. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the disclosure of Shoham, Lupien and Conklin and include multi-agent system with mathematical algorithm to create a uniform value and a market (buy/sell) system to help agents in marketing their goods and service.

Claims 41-42 and 44 have same limitations as claims 14-15 and 17 above, respectively.

Therefore these claims are rejected with same rational as claims 14-15 and 17.

***Response to Arguments previously presented are maintained (see paper number 20060912)***

***Conclusion***

1. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Harish T. Dass whose telephone number is 571-272-6793. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM to 4:50 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James A. Kramer can be reached on 571-272-6783. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3693

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Harish T Dass  
Examiner  
Art Unit 3693

*Harish T Dass*

4/30/07